



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/409,898	10/01/1999	ARILD O. GAUTESTAD	10250-0001-2	6015

22850 7590 04/10/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/409,898

Applicant(s)

GAUTESTAD, ARILD O.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3,6. 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application, and IDSs filed on 10/1/1999, 11/9/1999, 8/24/2001, 10/23/2001.

This action is made Non-final.

2. Claims 1-27 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, and 21 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 10/23/2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1), which requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Drawings

4. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 15 recites the limitation "the first computer id" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is no previous computer id in the claim or the claim(s) it depends from.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

8. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-12, 14, 16-17, 19-24, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by King et al, hereinafter King (Pat.# 5,956,737, 9/21/1999).

Regarding independent claim 1, King discloses the input, creation, and storage in a computer of a document with a *first item description*—"Rod products" description—, a *first item category*—"Bass Products" 162--, *first item identifier*—"Rod Products" 200. This document – 192--contains a list of descriptions, including a portion of Rod products description-- *first item description*, and a hypertext link reference to a more detailed web page of the Rods description. This document is created before a user accesses the document listing the items--192 (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16, fig. 12-14).

Claims 2-3 are directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 1, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, King discloses the input, creation, and storage in a computer of a document with a *second item description*—"Net products" description—, a *second item category*—"Bass Products" 162--, *second item identifier*—"Net

Products” 202. This document contains a list of a portion of Net products description, and a hypertext link reference to a more detailed web page of the Net description -- (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16, fig. 12-14).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, King discloses the storage of the document describing the products in a server side database -- (c.8,L.16-67).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, King discloses the creation of the HTML document using a template-- (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, King discloses a product web page with a reference to the home page—*first category list electronic document* (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16, fig. 12A-C).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 1, King discloses a product web page with a reference to the home page—*first category list electronic document*—according to the template (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16, fig. 12A-C).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 1, King discloses a computer application in a first computer for publishing HTML documents on Internet servers by transferring the documents to these Internet servers (c.6,L.50-67, c.8,L.19-67, c.51,L.7-67, fig. 12A-C).

Claim 12 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 11, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 14, 16-17, 19-20 are directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claims 11, 1, 4, and 6-7 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 21-24, and 26-27 are directed towards a computer program product for storing, and implementing the steps found in claims 1-4, and 6-7 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King.

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 12, King discloses a computer application in a first computer for publishing HTML documents on Internet servers by transferring the documents to these Internet servers (c.6,L.50-67, c.8,L.19-67, c.51,L.7-67, fig. 12A-C). King fails to explicitly disclose: *an Internet service provider computer*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the document in a second computer in an Internet service provider--ISP, because King teaches above the publishing of web page documents on the Internet from a local computer, so as to publish the web pages on the Internet on a ISP, which enables users across the Internet to access such web pages.

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, King discloses the creation of a document with a field containing product description, being stored in the computer (c.6,L.50-67,

c.8,L.19-67, c.51,L.7-67, fig. 12A-C). King fails to explicitly disclose: *store the first item description electronic document in the first digital storage area in the first computer using a first file name corresponding to the first item category*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stored the document with a file name corresponding to the category, because King teaches above the publishing of web page documents, and to label the document corresponding to the category document list.

11. Claims 5, 10, 18, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King, in view of Cohen et al, hereinafter Cohen (Pat. # 6,377,983, 4/23/2002, filed on 11/13/1998).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, King discloses the storage in a computer of a document containing formatted text with a *first item description*—"Rod products" description—, a *first item category*—"Bass Products" 162--, *first item identifier*—"Rod Products" 200. This document is converted from a single page document into a three pages an HTML document—*second digital storage area*. (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16, fig. 12-14). King fails to explicitly disclose: *generating a log file to include a reference to the first text formatted electronic document*. Cohen teaches a log file for storing experts' document browsing paths, which are updated with new document browsing paths. These paths enable a user to determine whether a document corresponds to the document paths (c.6,L.1-67, c.9,L.1-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the categorization taught by King, and the log file taught by Cohen, because Cohen teaches enabling a broad range of users to tap into experts knowledge by the user

Art Unit: 2178

of products and services (c.2,L.21-67), which would enable a user of King's invention to obtained highly relevant information concerning such products.

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 1, King discloses the display, and search of a document—194-- containing category information—"Bass Products"-- corresponding to the list included in a table of contents—*category list electronic document*—according to the template (c.10,L.23-67, c.18,L.57-c.19,L.16, fig. 12A-C). King fails to explicitly disclose: *using a log file to determine whether to retrieve the first item description electronic document...* Cohen teaches a log file for storing experts' document browsing paths, which are updated with new document browsing paths. These paths enable a user to determine whether a document corresponds to the document paths (c.6,L.1-67, c.9,L.1-67). However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the categorization taught by King, and the log file taught by Cohen, because Cohen teaches enabling a broad range of users to tap into experts knowledge by the user of products and services (c.2,L.21-67), which would enable a user of King's invention to obtained highly relevant information concerning such products.

Claim 18 is directed towards a system for implementing the steps found in claim 18, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 25 is directed towards a computer program product for storing, and implementing the steps found in claim 5, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prager (Pat. # 5,943,670, and 6,003,027), Raju et al. (Pat. # 6,067,541), Cheng et al. (Pat. # 6,519,597), Chakrabarti et al. (Pat. # 6,389,436), Ozaki et al. (Pat. # 5,991,798), Dolan et al. (Pat. # 5,991,798), Ueda (Pat. # 5,586,239), and Kudoh et al. (Pat. # 5,948,058).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 746-7238, (for **After Final** communications intended for entry)
- (703) 746-7239, (for **Formal** communications intended for entry, except formal After Final communications)

Or:

Application/Control Number: 09/409,898

Page 9

Art Unit: 2178

- (703) 746-7240, (for **Informal or Draft** communications for discussion only, please label

"PROPOSED" or **"DRAFT"**).

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**

CBP

3/27/03


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER